arXiv:1404.3340v1 [math.CV] 13 Apr 2014

CHEBYSHEV POLYNOMIALS on a SYSTEM of CONTINUA

Vladimir V. Andrievskii

Abstract

The estimates of the uniform norm of the Chebyshev polynomial associated with a compact set K consisting of a finite number of continua in the complex plane are established. These estimates are exact (up to a constant factor) in the case where the components of K are either quasismooth (in the sense of Lavrentiev) arcs or closed Jordan domains bounded by a quasismooth curve.

1. Introduction and Main Results

Let $K \subset \mathbf{C}$ be a compact set in the complex plane consisting of disjoint closed connected sets (continua) $K^j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, i.e.,

$$K = \cup_{j=1}^m K^j; \quad K^j \cap K^k = \emptyset \text{ for } j \neq k; \quad \operatorname{diam}(K^j) > 0.$$

Here

$$\operatorname{diam}(S) := \sup_{z,\zeta \in S} |z - \zeta|, \quad S \subset \mathbf{C}.$$

Denote by $T_n(z) = T_n(z, K), n \in \mathbf{N} := \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ the n-th Chebyshev polynomial associated with K, i.e., $T_n(z) = z^n + c_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \ldots + c_0, c_k \in \mathbf{C}$ is the (unique) monic polynomial which minimizes the supremum norm $||T_n||_K := \sup_{z \in K} |T_n(z)|$ among all monic polynomials of the same degree.

It is well-known (see, for example, [12, Theorem 5.5.4 and Corollary 5.5.5]) that

$$||T_n||_K \geq \operatorname{cap}(K)^n \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} ||T_n||_K^{1/n} = \operatorname{cap}(K),$$

where $\operatorname{cap}(S)$ denotes the logarithmic capacity of a compact set $S \subset \mathbf{C}$ (see [12, 13]).

We are interested in finding the estimates of $||T_n||_K$ from above. This problem attracted attention of many mathematicians; for the complete survey of results and further citations, see [14]-[21]. Without loss of generality we always assume that $\Omega := \mathbf{C} \setminus K$ is connected. Denote by $c, c_1, \ldots$ positive constants (different in different sections) that are either absolute or they depend only on K; otherwise, the dependence on other parameters is explicitly stated.

Date received: . Communicated by
AMS classification: 30A10, 30C10, 30C62, 30E10
Key words and phrases: Chebyshev polynomial, Equilibrium measure, Quasismooth curve.

Theorem 1 *Under the above assumptions,*

$$||T_n||_K \le c_1 \log(n+1)\ \mathrm{cap}(K)^n, \quad n \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{1.1}$$

The estimate (1.1) is surprising. It is unexpected even in the case where K is a continuum, i.e., $m = 1$. In this case, one of the major sources for estimates of $||T_n||_K$ are Faber polynomials $F_n(z) = F_n(z, K)$ associated with K (see [14, 16]). According to Koevary and Pommerenke [7, Theorem 1] (see also [16, Chapter IX, §4]), there exist a continuum K_0 with $\mathrm{cap}(K_0) = 1$ and an infinite set $\Lambda \subset \mathbf{N}$ such that for the (monic) polynomial $F_n(z) = F_n(z, K_0)$ and $n \in \Lambda$ we have

$$||F_n||_{K_0} > n^{\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 0.138.$$

It is interesting to compare this classic estimate with (1.1).

If more information is known about the geometry of K, (1.1) can be improved in the following way. A Jordan curve $L \subset \mathbf{C}$ is called quasismooth (in the sense of Lavrentiev) (see [11, p. 163]) if for every $z_1, z_2 \in L$,

$$|L(z_1, z_2)| \le c_2 |z_2 - z_1|, \tag{1.2}$$

where $L(z_1, z_2)$ is the shorter arc of L between z_1 and z_2, a constant c_2 depends on L, and $|S|$ is the linear measure (length) of a (Borel) set $S \subset \mathbf{C}$ (see [11, p. 129]). Any subarc of a quasismooth curve is called a quasismooth arc.

Theorem 2 *Let each K^j in the definition of K be either a quasismooth arc or a closed Jordan domain bounded by a quasismooth curve. Then*

$$||T_n||_K \le c_3\ \mathrm{cap}(K)^n, \quad n \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{1.3}$$

In the case of sufficiently smooth components K^j, the estimate (1.3) was proved in [21, Theorem 11.4] and recently in [19, Theorem 1.3]. Comparing (1.3) with known estimates for the Faber polynomials for a domain with the quasismooth boundary (see [10]) we also see the improvement by a logarithmic factor.

Our constructions below are based on the method of discretization of the equilibrium measure due to Totik [17]-[19], representation of the Green function via special conformal mappings due to Widom [21], and distortion properties of conformal mappings which can be found, for example, in [11] or [5].

We use the following notation. For the functions $a > 0$ and $b > 0$, we write $a \preceq b$ (order inequality) if $a \le cb$. The expression $a \asymp b$ means that $a \preceq b$ and $b \preceq a$ simultaneously. Moreover, for $z \in \mathbf{C}$ and $\delta > 0$ we let

$$C(\delta) := \{z : |z| = \delta\}, \quad \mathbf{D} := \{z : |z| < 1\}, \quad \mathbf{D}^* := \mathbf{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbf{D}},$$

$$d(S_1, S_2) := \inf_{z_1 \in S_1, z_2 \in S_2} |z_2 - z_1|, \quad S_1, S_2 \subset \mathbf{C}.$$

Let $m_2(S)$ be the two-dimensional Lebesgue measure (area) of a (Borel) set $S \subset \mathbf{C}$. For a bounded Jordan curve $J \subset \mathbf{C}$, denote by $\mathrm{int}\,(J)$ the bounded component of $\mathbf{C} \setminus J$.

2. Totik-Type Polynomials

In this section we review (in more general setting) the construction of the monic polynomials suggested in [17]-[19]. Let $K = \cup_{j=1}^m K^j$ be as above. We recall some general facts from potential theory which can be found, for example, in [20, 21, 12, 13]. Denote by $g(z) = g_\Omega(z, \infty), z \in \Omega$ Green's function for Ω with pole at infinity. It has a multiple-valued harmonic conjugate $\tilde{g}(z)$. Let

$$\Phi(z) := \exp(g(z) + i\tilde{g}(z)),$$

$$K_s := \{z \in \Omega : g(z) = s\}, \quad s > 0.$$

Note that

$$\mathrm{cap}(K_s) = e^s \ \mathrm{cap}(K). \tag{2.1}$$

Let $s_0 > 0$ be such that for $0 < s < 2s_0$, the set $K_s = \cup_{j=1}^m K_s^j$ consists of m mutually disjoined curves, where K_s^j is the curve surrounding K^j. Moreover, we can fix s_0 so small that

$$d(\zeta, K^j) = d(\zeta, K), \quad \zeta \in \mathrm{int}(K_{2s_0}^j). \tag{2.2}$$

Let $\mu = \mu_K$ be the equilibrium measure of K. According to Gauss' Theorem (see [13, p. 83]), for the net-change of the function $\tilde{g}$, we obtain

$$\Delta_{K_s^j} \tilde{g} := \int_{K_s^j} \frac{\partial \tilde{g}(\zeta)}{\partial t_\zeta} |d\zeta| = 2\pi\omega_j$$

(see [21, p. 140]), where $0 < s < 2s_0$, t_ζ is the tangent vector to the curve K_s^j (traversed in the positive, i.e., counterclockwise direction) at ζ, and $\omega_j := \mu(K^j)$.

Therefore, the function $\phi_j := \Phi^{1/\omega_j}(\zeta)$ is a conformal and univalent mapping of $\Omega^j := \mathrm{int}(K_{2s_0}^j) \setminus K^j$ onto the annulus $A^j := \{w : 1 < |w| < e^{2s_0/\omega_j}\}$ as well as

$$K_s^j = \{\zeta \in \Omega^j : |\phi_j(\zeta)| = e^{s/\omega_j}\}, \quad 0 < s < 2s_0.$$

Let $\mu_s := \mu_{K_s}$ be the equilibrium measure of K_s. By Gauss' Theorem (see [13, p. 83]),

$$\mu_s(K_s^j) = \mu(K^j) = \omega_j, \quad 0 < s < 2s_0.$$

Moreover, by virtue of [13, p. 90, Theorem 1.4], for any arc

$$\gamma = \{\zeta \in K_s^j : \theta_1 \le \arg \phi_j(\zeta) \le \theta_2\}, \quad 0 < \theta_2 - \theta_1 \le 2\pi$$

we have

$$\mu_s(\gamma) = \frac{(\theta_2 - \theta_1)\omega_j}{2\pi}. \tag{2.3}$$

Assuming that $n \in \mathbf{N}$ is sufficiently large, i.e., $n > n_1 := 10/(\min_j \omega_j)$ we let

$$n_j := [n\omega_j], \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1,$$

$$n_m := n - (n_1 + \ldots + n_{m-1}),$$

where $[a]$ means the integer part of a real number a.

Therefore,

$$0 \le n_m - n\omega_m = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (n\omega_j - n_j) \le m - 1. \tag{2.4}$$

Next, for $0 < s < s_0/2$, we represent each K_s^j as the union of closed subarcs $I_k^j, k = 1, \ldots, n_j$ such that their interiors do not intersect,

$$I_k^j \cap I_{k+1}^j =: \xi_k^j, \quad k = 1, \ldots, n_j - 1,$$

and $I_{n_j}^j \cap I_1^j =: \xi_{n_j}^j$ are points of K_s^j ordered in a positive direction, and

$$\mu_s(I_k^j) = \frac{\omega_j}{n_j}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, n_j.$$

Let $\xi_0^j := \xi_{n_j}^j$ and let $\eta_0^j < \eta_1^j < \ldots < \eta_{n_j}^j = \eta_0^j + 2\pi$ be determined by $\phi_j(\xi_k^j) = \exp((s/\omega_j) + i\eta_k^j)$, i.e., $\eta_k^j - \eta_{k-1}^j = 2\pi/n_j$. Consider

$$\tilde{B}_k^j := \left\{ w = re^{i\eta} : \eta_{k-1}^j \le \eta \le \eta_k^j, 0 \le r - e^{s/\omega_j} \le \frac{2\pi}{n_j} \right\}.$$

Further, we assume that

$$n > n_2 := \frac{2\pi}{\min_j \left(e^{s_0/\omega_j} - e^{s_0/(2\omega_j)} \right)}, \tag{2.5}$$

which implies $\tilde{B}_k^j \subset E^j := \{w : 1 < |w| < e^{s_0/\omega_j}\}$. Let $B_k^j := \psi_j(\tilde{B}_k^j)$, where $\psi_j := \phi_j^{-1}$.

Lemma 1 *There exist constants c and $n_0 = n_0(K, c) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for $s = s(n) = c/n < s_0/2$ and $n > n_0$ we have*

$$d(I_k^j, K) \asymp |\xi_k^j - \xi_{k-1}^j| \le \operatorname{diam}(I_k^j) \le |I_k^j| \le 0.1 d(I_k^j, K) \tag{2.6}$$

$$|\xi_k^j - \xi_{k-1}^j|^2 \asymp m_2(B_k^j) \asymp \operatorname{diam}(B_k^j)^2 \le \frac{1}{4} d(B_k^j, K)^2. \tag{2.7}$$

For the proof of the lemma, see Section 3.

For sufficiently large $n > n_0$ and $s := c/n$ as in Lemma 1, consider the points

$$\zeta_k^j := \frac{1}{\mu_s(I_k^j)} \int_{I_k^j} \xi d\mu_s(\xi)$$

and the polynomial

$$P_n(z) := \prod_{j=1}^{m} \prod_{k=1}^{n_j} (z - \zeta_k^j).$$

According to Lemma 1,

$$|\zeta_k^j - \xi_k^j| = \left| \frac{1}{\mu_s(I_k^j)} \int_{I_k^j} (\xi - \xi_k^j) d\mu_s(\xi) \right| \leq 0.1 d(I_k^j, K)$$

and for $\xi \in I_k^j$,

$$|\xi - \zeta_k^j| \leq |\xi - \xi_k^j| + |\xi_k^j - \zeta_k^j| \leq 0.2 d(I_k^j, K). \tag{2.8}$$

For $z \in K$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} n \log \ \mathrm{cap}(K_s) &= \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \left(n - \frac{n_j}{\omega_j} \right) \int_{I_k^j} \log |z - \xi| d\mu_s(\xi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \frac{1}{\mu_s(I_k^j)} \int_{I_k^j} \log |z - \xi| d\mu_s(\xi) \\ &=: \Sigma_1(z) + \Sigma_2(z). \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Since for $\xi \in K_s$ and $z \in K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{K_s} |\log |z - \xi|| d\mu_s(\xi) &\leq |\log \mathrm{diam}(K_s)| + \int_{K_s} \log \frac{\mathrm{diam}(K_s)}{|z - \xi|} d\mu_s(\xi) \\ &\leq 2 \log^+ \mathrm{diam}(K_s) - \log \ \mathrm{cap}(K_s) \preceq 1, \end{aligned}$$

by virtue of (2.4) we obtain

$$|\Sigma_1(z)| \preceq \int_{K_s} |\log |z - \xi|| d\mu_s(\xi) \preceq 1. \tag{2.10}$$

Furthermore,

$$\log |P_n(z)| - \Sigma_2(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \frac{1}{\mu_s(I_k^j)} \int_{I_k^j} \log \left| \frac{z - \zeta_k^j}{z - \xi} \right| d\mu_s(\xi) \tag{2.11}$$

which, together with (2.6) and (2.8), imply that for $z \in K$ and $\xi \in I_k^j$,

$$\log \left| \frac{z-\zeta_k^j}{z-\xi} \right| = -\Re \log \left(1 + \frac{\zeta_k^j - \xi}{z-\zeta_k^j} \right)$$

$$= \Re \left(\frac{\xi - \zeta_k^j}{z-\zeta_k^j} \right) + A(\xi), \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$|A(\xi)| \preceq \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam}(I_k^j)}{d(z, I_k^j)} \right)^2.$$

Since by the definition of ζ_k^j,

$$\int_{I_k^j} (\xi - \zeta_k^j) d\mu_s(\xi) = 0,$$

according to (2.9)-(2.12) we have

$$|\log|P_n(z)| - n \log \operatorname{cap}(K_s)| \preceq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \frac{1}{\mu_s(I_k^j)} \int_{I_k^j} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam}(I_k^j)}{d(z, I_k^j)} \right)^2 d\mu_s(\xi)$$

$$= 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam}(I_k^j)}{d(z, I_k^j)} \right)^2 =: 1 + \Sigma_3(z). \tag{2.13}$$

Next, we formulate a statement which is proved in Section 3. Let

$$\Omega_s := \{\zeta \in \Omega : s \le g(\zeta) \le 2s\}, \quad s > 0.$$

Lemma 2 *For $z \in K$ and $n > n_0$ we have*

$$\Sigma_3(z) \preceq \int_{K_{c/n}} \frac{d(\zeta, K)}{|\zeta - z|^2} |d\zeta|, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\Sigma_3(z) \preceq \int_{\Omega_{c/n}} \frac{dm_2(\zeta)}{|\zeta - z|^2}. \tag{2.15}$$

Thus, (2.1), (2.13), and Lemma 2 imply the following result which is of independent interest.

Theorem 3 *There exist constants* c, c_1, c_2, *and* $n_0 = n_0(K, c)$ *such that for* $n > n_0$ *we have*

$$||T_n||_K \le c_1 \ \mathrm{cap}(K)^n \sup_{z\in\partial K} \int_{K_{c/n}} \frac{d(\zeta, K)}{|\zeta - z|^2}|d\zeta|, \tag{2.16}$$

$$||T_n||_K \le c_2 \ \mathrm{cap}(K)^n \sup_{z\in\partial K} \int_{\Omega_{c/n}} \frac{dm_2(\zeta)}{|\zeta - z|^2}. \tag{2.17}$$

3. Distortion Properties of ϕ_j

By [5, p. 23, Lemma 2.3], which is an immediate consequence of Koebe's one-quarter theorem, we have the following statement. Recall that $\psi_j := \phi_j^{-1}$ is defined in $A^j := \{w : 1 < |w| < e^{2s_0/\omega_j}\}$ and $E^j := \{w : 1 < |w| < e^{s_0/\omega_j}\}$.

Lemma 3 *For* $w \in E^j$ *and* $z = \psi_j(w)$,

$$c_1^{-1}\frac{d(z, K^j)}{|w| - 1} \le |\psi_j'(w)| \le c_1\frac{d(z, K^j)}{|w| - 1}.$$

Moreover, if $|\tau - w| \le (|w| - 1)/2$ *and* $\zeta = \psi_j(\tau)$, *then*

$$c_2^{-1}\frac{|\tau - w|)}{|w| - 1} \le \frac{|\zeta - z|}{d(z, K^j)} \le c_2\frac{|\tau - w|}{|w| - 1}. \tag{3.1}$$

In addition to the mapping ϕ_j, we consider a conformal (and univalent) mapping $\Phi_j : \mathbf{C} \setminus K^j \to \mathbf{D}^*$ normalized by the condition $\Phi_j(\infty) = \infty$ Then $h_j := \Phi_j \circ \psi_j$ is a conformal mapping of A^j onto a doubly connected domain bounded by a unit circle and the curve $h_j(C(e^{2s_0/\omega_j})) \subset \mathbf{D}^*$. According to the Carathéodory prime end theorem (see [11, p. 30, Theorem 2.15]), h_j can be extended continuously to the unit circle $C(1)$. Moreover, by the Schwarz reflection principle (see [11, p. 4]) h_j can be extended analytically into $\{w : e^{-2s_0/\omega_j} < |w| < e^{2s_0/\omega_j}\}$. This implies that

$$\left|\frac{h_j(w_2) - h_j(w_1)}{w_2 - w_1}\right| \asymp 1, \quad w_1, w_2 \in E^j. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $\psi_j = \Phi_j^{-1} \circ h_j$ in E^j, according to (3.2), many known distortion properties of Φ_j and Φ_j^{-1} imply the analogous properties of ϕ_j and ψ_j. We describe some of them.

Let for $0 < \delta \le \delta_j := e^{s_0/(2\omega_j)} - 1$,

$$L_\delta^j := K_{\omega_j \log(1+\delta)} = \{z : |\phi_j(z)| = 1 + \delta\}. \tag{3.3}$$

For the points $z_k \in L^j_\delta$ and $w_k := \phi_j(z_k) = (1+\delta)e^{i\theta_k}, k = 1,2$, such that $0 < \theta_2 - \theta_1 < 2\pi$, consider

$$\hat{L}^j_\delta(z_1, z_2) := \{z = \psi_j((1+\delta)e^{i\theta}) : \theta_1 \le \theta \le \theta_2\},$$

$B^j_\delta(z_1, z_2) := \{z = \psi_j(re^{i\theta}) : \theta_1 \le \theta \le \theta_2, 0 \le r-1-\delta \le \min(\theta_2-\theta_1, e^{s_0/\omega_j}-1-\delta)\}$.

By virtue of Lemma 3, for $z_1, z_2 \in L^j_\delta$ and $\zeta \in B^j_\delta(z_1, z_2)$ such that $\theta_2 - \theta_1 \le \delta/c_3$, where $c_3 = 10c_2(1+\max_j \delta_j)$, we have

$$\theta_2 - \theta_1 < \delta \le e^{s_0/(2\omega_j)} - 1 < e^{s_0/\omega_j} - e^{s_0/(2\omega_j)} \le e^{s_0/\omega_j} - 1 - \delta,$$

$$\frac{|\zeta - z_1|}{d(z_1, K^j)} \le c_2 \frac{2(\theta_2-\theta_1)(1+\delta_j)}{\delta} \le \frac{1}{5}, \tag{3.4}$$

i.e., $|\psi_j'(\zeta)| \asymp d(z_1, K^j)/\delta$ and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\theta_2-\theta_1}{c_4\delta} d(z_1, K^j) &\le |z_2 - z_1| \le |\hat{L}^j_\delta(z_1, z_2)| \\ &= (1+\delta)\int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} |\psi_j'((1+\delta)e^{i\theta})| d\theta \le c_4 \frac{\theta_2-\theta_1}{\delta} d(z_1, K^j), \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} c_5^{-1}\left(\frac{\theta_2-\theta_1}{\delta}\right)^2 d(z_1, K^j)^2 &\le m_2(B^j_\delta(z_1, z_2)) = \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2}\int_{1+\delta}^{1+\delta+\theta_2-\theta_1} |\psi_j'(re^{i\theta})|^2 r dr d\theta \\ &\le c_5\left(\frac{\theta_2-\theta_1}{\delta}\right)^2 d(z_1, K^j)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Proof of Lemma 1. First, we note that by (3.3) $K^j_s = L^j_\delta$, where

$$\frac{s}{\omega_j} \le \delta = e^{s/\omega_j} - 1 \le e^{s_0/(2\omega_j)}\frac{s}{\omega_j}, \quad 0 < \delta < \delta_j. \tag{3.7}$$

By (2.2), (2.3), and (3.5) if $2\pi/n_j \le \delta/c_3$ and $n > n_1 = 10/(\min_j \omega_j)$, then

$$|I^j_k| \le c_4 \frac{2\pi}{n_j\delta} d(\xi^j_{k-1}, K^j) \le \frac{4\pi c_4}{ns} d(\xi^j_{k-1}, K).$$

Therefore, if we let $c = 100\pi c_4$, then, for $n > n_0 := n_1 + n_2 + 2c/s_0$, where n_2 is defined in (2.5), and $s = c/n$ we obtain the last inequality in (2.6). Moreover, (2.2) and the left-hand side of (3.1) with $z = \xi^j_{k-1}$ and $\zeta = \xi^j_k$ yield the first inequality in (2.6).

Furthermore, (2.6), (3.4), (3.6), and (3.7) imply first two order equivalences in (2.7). The last inequality in (2.7) follows from (2.2) and (3.4) with $z_1 = \xi^j_{k-1}$.

□

Proof of Lemma 2. By (2.6) for $z \in K$ we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam}(I^j_k)}{d(z, I^j_k)} \right)^2 \preceq \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \frac{|I^j_k| d(I^j_k, K^j)}{d(z, I^j_k)^2} \preceq \int_{K^j_s} \frac{d(\zeta, K)}{|\zeta - z|^2} |d\zeta|,$$

which implies (2.14).

Furthermore, by Lemma 1 for $z \in K$ we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam}(I^j_k)}{d(z, I^j_k)} \right)^2 \preceq \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \frac{m_2(B^j_k)}{d(z, B^j_k)^2} \preceq \int_{\Omega^j_s} \frac{dm_2(\zeta)}{|\zeta - z|^2},$$

where $\Omega^j_s := \{\zeta \in \operatorname{int}(K^j_{2s_0}) : s \le g(\zeta) \le 2s\}$, which yields (2.15).

□

Proof of Theorem 1. Without loss of generality we can assume that n is sufficiently large. By virtue of (3.2) and the Loewner inequality (see [9] or [5, p. 27, Lemma 2.5]) for $0 < \delta < \delta_j$ we obtain $d(K^j, L^j_\delta) \succeq \delta^2$, which, together with (3.7), imply

$$d_s := d(K, K_s) \succeq s^2, \quad 0 < s < \frac{s_0}{2}. \tag{3.8}$$

Therefore, for $z \in \partial K$,

$$\int_{\Omega_s} \frac{dm_2(\zeta)}{|\zeta - z|^2} \le \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{d_s}^{c_6} \frac{r dr d\theta}{r^2} = 2\pi \log \frac{c_6}{d_s}$$

and (1.1) follows from (2.17) and (3.8).

□

4. Quasismooth Components

We need the concept of quasiconformality which can be found in [2] or [8]. Moreover, almost all facts, necessary for our consideration, can be derived from a simple statement on the change of the relative positions of three points under a quasiconformal mapping. We formulate it in a slightly more general form than, for example, in [4, 5]. However, it is clear how the proof from there has to be modified to prove the following result (cf. [1]).

Lemma 4 *([5, p. 29, Theorem 2.7]). Let $w = F(\zeta)$ be a Q-quasiconformal mapping of a domain $G \subset \mathbf{C}$ and let $\zeta_k \in E \subset G, w_k := F(\zeta_k), k = 1, 2, 3$, where E is a compact set. Then, the following is true.*

(i) The conditions $|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| \le c_1|\zeta_1 - \zeta_3|$ and $|w_1 - w_2| \le c_2|w_1 - w_3|$ are equivalent. Besides, the constants c_1 and c_2 are mutually dependent and depend on Q, G, and E.

(ii) If $|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| \le c_1|\zeta_1 - \zeta_3|$, then

$$c_3^{-1}\left|\frac{w_1 - w_3}{w_1 - w_2}\right|^{1/Q} \le \left|\frac{\zeta_1 - \zeta_3}{\zeta_1 - \zeta_2}\right| \le c_3\left|\frac{w_1 - w_3}{w_1 - w_2}\right|^{Q},$$

where $c_3 \ge 1$ depends on c_1, Q, G, and E.

First, we consider the case where a component K^j of K is a domain bounded by a quasismooth curve $L^j := \partial K^j$. By (1.2) and Ahlfors' theorem (see [8, p. 100, Theorem 8.6]) L^j is quasiconformal and ϕ_j can be extended to a quasiconformal homeomorphism of a neighborhood $N^j =: G$ of $\psi_j(\overline{E^j}) =: E$. Here $E^j = \{w : 1 < |w| < e^{s_0/\omega_j}\}$. For $\zeta \in E$ denote by $\zeta_0 \in L^j$ any point with $|\zeta - \zeta_0| = d(\zeta, L^j)$ and let $\zeta^* := \psi_j(\phi_j(\zeta)/|\phi_j(\zeta)|)$. Furthermore, for $0 < \delta \le \delta_j = e^{s_0/(2\omega_j)} - 1$ and $z \in L^j$ denote by $z_\delta \in L^j_\delta$ any point with $|z - z_\delta| = d(z, L^j_\delta)$ and let $z^*_\delta := \psi_j((1+\delta)\phi_j(z))$. Applying Lemma 4(i) to the triplets z, z^*_δ, z_δ and ζ, ζ^*, ζ_0 we obtain

$$d(z, L^j_\delta) = |z - z_\delta| \asymp |z - z^*_\delta|,$$
$$d(\zeta, L^j) = |\zeta - \zeta_0| \asymp |\zeta - \zeta^*|.$$

Moreover, repeated application of Lemma 4 implies that for $z \in L^j$ and $\zeta \in L^j_\delta$,

$$|\zeta - z| \le |\zeta - \zeta^*| + |\zeta^* - z| \preceq |z^*_\delta - \zeta^*|$$

and

$$\frac{d(\zeta, L^j)}{|\zeta - z|} \le \left|\frac{\zeta - \zeta^*}{\zeta - z}\right| \preceq \left|\frac{\phi_j(\zeta) - \phi_j(\zeta^*)}{\phi_j(\zeta) - \phi_j(z)}\right|^{1/Q} = \left|\frac{\phi_j(z^*_\delta) - \phi_j(z)}{\phi_j(z^*_\delta) - \phi_j(\zeta^*)}\right|^{1/Q}$$

$$\preceq \left|\frac{z^*_\delta - z}{z^*_\delta - \zeta^*}\right|^{1/Q^2} \preceq \left(\frac{d(z, L^j_\delta)}{|\zeta - z|}\right)^{1/Q^2}. \tag{4.1}$$

We claim that L^j_δ are "uniformly" quasismooth. That is, for $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in L^j_\delta$, denote by $L^j_\delta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ the shorter arc of L^j_δ between ζ_1 and ζ_2.

Lemma 5 *For $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in L^j_\delta$ and $0 < \delta < \delta_j$,*

$$|L^j_\delta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)| \preceq |\zeta_2 - \zeta_1|. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Let

$$\gamma := L^j_\delta(\zeta_1,\zeta_2) = \{\psi_j((1+\delta)e^{i\theta}) : \theta_1 \le \theta \le \theta_2\}, \quad 0 < \theta_2 - \theta_1 < 2\pi,$$

$$\phi_j(\zeta_k) =: \tau_k = (1+\delta)e^{i\theta_k}, \quad k = 1,2.$$

According to (3.1) and (3.5) there exists a sufficiently large constant c_4 such that if $\theta_2 - \theta_1 \le \delta/c_4 =: \varepsilon\delta$ then

$$|\gamma| \preceq d(\zeta_1, L^j)\frac{|\tau_2 - \tau_1|}{\delta} \asymp |\zeta_2 - \zeta_1|. \tag{4.3}$$

Therefore, we can assume that $\theta_2 - \theta_1 > \varepsilon\delta$. Let $\gamma^* := \{\psi_j(e^{i\theta}) : \theta_1 \le \theta \le \theta_2\}$. Consider the points $\theta_1 =: \eta_1 < \eta_2 < \ldots < \eta_p := \theta_2$ such that

$$\frac{\varepsilon\delta}{2} \le \eta_{k+1} - \eta_k \le \varepsilon\delta, \quad k = 1,\ldots,p-1.$$

Let

$$\xi_k := \psi_j((1+\delta)e^{i\eta_k}), \quad \xi^*_k := \psi_j(e^{i\eta_k}),$$
$$\gamma_k := \{\zeta = \psi_j((1+\delta)e^{i\theta}) : \eta_k \le \theta \le \eta_{k+1}\},$$
$$\gamma^*_k := \{z = \psi_j(e^{i\theta}) : \eta_k \le \theta \le \eta_{k+1}\},$$

By virtue of Lemma 4(i), (4.3), and our assumption that L^j is quasismooth we have

$$|\zeta_2 - \zeta_1| \asymp |\zeta_2 - \xi^*_1| \asymp |\xi^*_p - \xi^*_1| \asymp |\gamma^*|$$

as well as

$$|\gamma_k| \asymp |\xi_{k+1} - \xi_k| \asymp |\xi^*_k - \xi_k| \asymp |\xi^*_k - \xi^*_{k+1}| \asymp |\gamma^*_k|.$$

Hence,

$$|\gamma| = \sum_{k=1}^{p-1}|\gamma_k| \asymp \sum_{k=1}^{p-1}|\gamma^*_k| = |\gamma^*| \asymp |\zeta_2 - \zeta_1|.$$

□

Further, we claim that for $z \in \partial K$ and $0 < \delta \le \delta_j$,

$$\int_{L^j_\delta} \frac{d(\zeta, L^j)}{|\zeta - z|^2}|d\zeta| \preceq 1. \tag{4.4}$$

Indeed, the only nontrivial case is where $z \in L^j$. In this case, according to Lemma 5 and [3, (3.20)], for $\alpha > 0$ we have

$$\int_{L^j_\delta} \frac{|d\zeta|}{|\zeta - z|^{1+\alpha}} \le c_5 d(z, L^j_\delta)^{-\alpha}, \tag{4.5}$$

where c_5 depends on K and α. Furthermore, by virtue of (4.1) and (4.5),

$$\int_{L^j_\delta} \frac{d(\zeta, L^j)}{|\zeta - z|^2}|d\zeta| \preceq \int_{L^j_\delta} \frac{d(z, L^j_\delta)^{1/Q^2}}{|\zeta - z|^{1+1/Q^2}}|d\zeta| \preceq 1$$

which yields (4.4).

Next, let $K^j =: L^j$ be a quasismooth arc. Below, we show how to modify the above reasoning to obtain (4.4) as well. We only give the main ideas of the proof. Denote by z_1 and z_2 the endpoints of L^j. For $k = 1, 2$, let $w_k := \phi_j(z_k)$,

$$E^j_1 := \{w : 1 < |w| < e^{s_0/\omega_j}, \arg w_1 < \arg w < \arg w_2\},$$

$$E^j_2 := E^j \setminus \overline{E^j_1}, \quad R^j_k := \psi_j(E^j_k), \quad L^j_{\delta,k} := L^j_\delta \cap \overline{R^j_k}.$$

According to the Ahlfors criterion (see [8, p. 100, Theorem 8.6]) ∂E^j_k is a quasiconformal curve. Moreover, repeating the proof of [5, p. 30, Lemma 2.8] practically word for word, we can show that ∂R^j_k is also a quasiconformal curve. Therefore, ψ_j can be extended quasiconformally into a neighborhood N^j_k of $\overline{E^j_k}$. Denote this extension by $\psi_{j,k}$. Next, we can use Lemma 4 with $F = \psi_{j,k}, E = \overline{E^j_k}$, and $G = N^j_k$ to prove the analogues of (4.1), (4.2), and (4.5) with $L^j_{\delta,k}$ instead of L^j_δ (for more detail, see the proof of [6, Lemma 2.3]). This implies (4.4) in the case of a quasismooth arc L^j as well. Summarizing, we have the following result.

Lemma 6 *If the components of K are either closed Jordan domains bounded by a quasismooth curve or quasismooth arcs, then for $z \in \partial K$ and $0 < s \le s_0/2$,*

$$\int_{K_s} \frac{d(\zeta, K)}{|\zeta - z|^2}|d\zeta| \preceq 1.$$

Proof of Theorem 2. The inequality (1.3) follows immediately from (2.16) and Lemma 6.

□

5. Acknowledgements

The author would like to warmly thank M. Nesterenko for many useful remarks.

References

[1] F. G. Abdullaev (1986): On Orthogonal Polynomials in Domains with Quasiconformal Boundary. Dissertation, Donetsk (Russian).

[2] L. V. Ahlfors (1966): Lectures on Quasiconformal Mappings. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.

[3] V. V. Andrievskii (2012): *Weighted L_p Bernstein-type inequalities on a quasismooth curve in the complex plane.* Acta Math. Hungar., **135(1-2)**:8–23.

[4] V. V. Andrievskii, V. I. Belyi, V. K. Dzjadyk (1995): Conformal Invariants in Constructive Theory of Functions of Complex Variable. Atlanta, Georgia: World Federation Publisher.

[5] V. V. Andrievskii, H.- P. Blatt (2002): Discrepancy of Signed Measures and Polynomial Approximation. Berlin/New York: Springer-Verlag.

[6] V. V. Andrievskii, V. V. Maimeskul (1995): *Constructive description of certain classes of functions on quasismooth arcs.* Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math., **44**:193–206.

[7] T. Kövary, Ch. Pommerenke (1967): *On Faber polynomials and Faber expansions.* Mathem. Zeitschr., **99**:193–206.

[8] O. Lehto, K. I. Virtanen (1973): Quasiconformal Mappings in the Plane, 2nd ed., New York: Springer-Verlag.

[9] K. Löwner (1919): *Über Extremumsätze der konformen Abbildung des Äusseren des Einheitskreises.* Math. Z., **3**:65–77.

[10] F. D. Lesley, V. S. Vinge, S. E. Warschawski (1974): *Approximation by polynomials for a class of Jordan domains.* Mathem. Zeitschr., **138**:225–237.

[11] Ch. Pommerenke (1992): Boundary Behaviour of Conformal Maps. Berlin/New York: Springer-Verlag.

[12] T. Ransford (1995): Potential Theory in the Complex Plane, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[13] E. B. Saff , V. Totik (1997): Logarithmic Potentials with External Fields, New York/Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

[14] V. I. Smirnov, N. A. Lebedev (1968): Functions of a Complex Variable. Constructive Theory, Cambridge: Mass. Institute of Technology.

[15] M. L. Sodin, P. M. Yuditskii (1993): *Functions least deviating from zero on closed subsets of the real line.* St. Petersburg Math. J., **4**:201–249.

[16] P. K. Suetin (1998): Series of Faber Polynomials, Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

[17] V. Totik (2012): *Chebyshev polynomials on a system of curves.* Journal D'Analyse Mathématique, **118**:317–338.

[18] V. Totik (2013): *Chebyshev polynomials on compact sets.* Potential Anal., http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11118-013-9357-6.

[19] V. Totik (2014): *Asymptotics of Christoffel functions on arcs and curves.* Advances in Mathematics, **252**:114–149.

[20] J. L. Walsh (1969): Interpolation and Approximation by Rational Functions in the Complex Plane, 5th ed. Providence, American Mathematical Society.

[21] H. Widom (1969): *Extremal polynomials assosiated with a system of curves in the complex plane.* Adv. Math., **3**:127–232.

V. V. Andrievskii

Department of Mathematical Sciences

Kent State University

Kent, OH 44242

USA

e-mail: andriyev@math.kent.edu

tel: 330-672-9029